REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

The claims are amended to address the objections noted in paragraph 2 of the Office Action.

Claims 14-26 are pending in this application. Claims 14-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. patent 6,092,798 to <u>Hiratuka et al.</u> (hereinafter "<u>Hiratuka</u>") in view of U.S. patent 5,488,223 to <u>Austin et al.</u> (hereinafter "Austin").

Applicants initially note that the statement of the rejection in paragraph 5 of the Office Action references patents to Swartz et al. and Bergman et al., whereas the body of the rejection references patents to Hiratuka and Austin. In reviewing the cited disclosures in the references it appears clear that the proper statement of the rejection should be based on Hiratuka in view of Austin, and that rejection is addressed below.

Applicants respectfully submit that the outstanding rejection is improper in not fully considering the claimed features directed to the "configuration ticket". In the claimed invention, in a machine having a magnetic read/write station, a thermal printing station and a control, a configuration ticket can be prepared, which may have the same format as the ticket normally issued by the machine, and the configuration ticket includes "at least certain operating parameters of the ticket processing device". With such a structure configuration parameters can be printed on a same ticket as a ticket normally issued by the machine, and that at the creation of the configuration data it is assured that the printed information on the configuration ticket matches the magnetic information stored in the configuration ticket. Further, such a ticket can be used such that it can be read by the read/write section of the machine to thereby input configuration information into the machine.

Such a structure can find particular usefulness because ticket processing devices are often installed in various places. Thus, the people servicing such devices normally have to

handle a number of capabilities, ranging from purely mechanical capabilities to having the ability to configure the machine. The present invention makes it possible for persons who may have little or no knowledge about what is necessary to configure the machine to only go to the machine with a "configuration ticket" prepared in advance by personnel specifically trained in configuring such a machine. In that instance such a service person merely has to put the previously prepared configuration ticket into the machine to properly configure the machine as desired. Further, the printed indications on the configuration ticket provide a clear trace of what has been performed by the servicing personnel.

The features of the claimed invention with respect to the configuration device are believed to be neither taught nor suggested by the applied art.

First, applicants submit that the outstanding rejection is improper in that the relied upon teachings in <u>Hiratuka</u> do not even teach the features noted in the Office Action.

Specifically, <u>Hiratuka</u> is cited to disclose a configuration ticket 4. That basis for the outstanding rejection is believed to be improper as element 4 in <u>Hiratuka</u> is not a configuration ticket. Element 4 in <u>Hiratuka</u> is a ticket sheet, but is not disclosed as providing any configuration information. In the claims as currently written, the configuration ticket includes configuration parameters that enable a controller to configure functions of the ticket processing device. The basic ticket sheet 4 in <u>Hiratuka</u> does not store any parameters that could be utilized for configuring a ticket processing device.

The Office Action actually appears to even somewhat recognize such a deficiency in <u>Hiratuka</u> as the outstanding Office Action states:

Hiratuka et al fails to teach or fairly suggest that the information written on/read from the magnetic stripe contents at least certain operating parameters of the ticket processing device, which enables the control means to configure functioning the ticket processing device with the aid of the stored configuration parameters, and which enable the installer to have a

¹ Office Action of June 10, 2003, page 3, lines 3-6 of pre-numbered paragraph 5.

configuration ticket on which the corresponding configuration parameters are printed.

Austin et al teaches the printer operating parameters are automatically adjusted based on the read information contended within a barcode/magnetic stripe. . .

It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate [the teachings] of Austin et al into the teachings of Hiratuka et al in order to provide Hiratuka et al with a more accurate, efficient, and time consuming system wherein the operating parameters contended within the barcode/magnetic stripe can be entered into the system accurately within no time comparing to manually enter by an operator, and thus reducing time and labor and also preventing the content information from being manipulating intentionally or unintentionally.²

The above-identified basis for modifying <u>Hiratuka</u> in view of the teachings of <u>Austin</u> is believed to be improper as <u>Austin</u> does not overcome the deficiencies in <u>Hiratuka</u> and the teachings in <u>Austin</u> are not properly combinable with the teachings in <u>Hiratuka</u>.

First, <u>Austin</u> merely refers to a regular printing machine, which in fact is intended to print barcode information. There is no indication or suggestion in <u>Austin</u> that the machine disclosed therein could even be utilized with a magnetic read/write station.

In <u>Austin</u> the printing machine may also include a scanner, which can read information written in barcodes. The basic concept of the device of <u>Austin</u> is that the user will select barcode information that may be necessary to give the printer certain configuration data.

Austin, however, provides absolutely no teaching or suggestion of combining a printing machine together with a magnetic read/write station, using a ticket having magnetic information to configure the machine, and using the printed information of the ticket as a clear written record of the configuration data having actually been entered.

As noted above, the claims as currently written are directed to a man-machine interface method in which a configuration ticket contains configuration parameters that are

² Office Action of June 10, 2003, the paragraphs bridging pages 3 and 4.

Reply to Office Action of June 10, 2003

read by a magnetic read/write station. The configuration parameters are utilized to configure

the actual ticket processing device. Clearly, Hiratuka does not even address such a concept

of utilizing the ticket sheet 4 to configure the device therein. Further, Austin does not teach

or suggest any concept in which a configuration ticket is utilized in a ticket processing

device.

Further, even if the teachings in Hiratuka and Austin were combined such a

combination of teachings would not result in the claimed device.

Austin discloses a barcode printer that can scan a barcode image. Combining such

teachings of Austin to those in Hiratuka would obviously result in adding a barcode system

for configuration data in the device of Hiratuka, as that is what Austin discloses.

Combining the teachings in Austin to those in Hiratuka clearly would not have

suggested to one of ordinary skill in the art modifying the ticket sheet 4 in Hiratuka to also

include configuration information as Austin does not provide any type of similar teaching.

In such ways, applicants respectfully submit that the claims as currently written

distinguish over the combination of teachings of Hiratuka in view of Austin.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the

present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested

that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,

MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000

Fax: (703) 413 -2220

(OSMMN 08/03)

I:\ATTY\SNS\21's\216606\216606-AMD.DOC

Gregory J. Maier

Attorney of Record

Registration No. 25,599

Surinder Sachar

Registration No. 34,423